

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-31 remain in the application, all of which stand rejected.

1. Rejection of Claims 9 and 10 Under 35 USC 112

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, claim 9 is indicated to recite the limitation "each directory", without providing antecedent basis for same.

In response to the Examiner's rejection, claim 9 has been amended, without the introduction of new matter, to clarify that the "each directory" is "each of a number of file directories".

2. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 14-16, 17, 20, 21, 24 and 29-31 Under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 14-16, 17, 20, 21, 24 and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,903,720 to Stokes.

With respect to Applicant's claim 1, the Examiner asserts that:

...Stokes discloses an object authorization system wherein databases are maintained designating files as belonging to certain objects (i.e. safe zones), and authorization spaces (information structures) which contain access rights determining whether particular users' permission levels (filters) for files within the respective objects. These structures are used in response to attempted file accesses (see column 5, line 44 to column 6, line 31). Each object may be a file (see column 5, lines 27-32), and the collection of objects constitutes the first database.

5/5/2005 Office Action, sec. 3, p. 3.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant's claim 1 recites, in part:

maintaining a first database which identifies files stored on the computer to be included in a safe zone;
maintaining a second database which defines authorized accesses to said files within said safe zone;

Although the Examiner asserts that Stokes' collection of objects (or files) is equivalent to Applicant's "first database which identifies files. . . included in a safe zone", this position is not supported by Stokes' teachings. Stokes does not teach any maintenance of a safe "zone". Rather, Stokes presumes that all files (objects 46, 64) are associated with access rights (authorization information 52, 70), but that the access rights associated with different files may be maintained by different authorization systems 28, 32. See, Stokes, col. 6, lines 32-50. This is different than what is disclosed in Applicant's claim 1, where, "upon a request for access to a file", a filter is used "to access said first database and determine whether [the] file is within [the] safe zone", and then "if [the] file is determined to be within said [the] zone", the second database is accessed to determine whether the request to access the file has been authorized. When authorizing access in accord with Applicant's claim 1, a determination that a file is not within the safe zone allows further authentication overhead to be bypassed. However, by failing to maintain the first database, Stokes requires a check of file access rights for each and every file in a file system.

The Examiner *may* believe that Stokes' authentication method merely treats an entire file system as one big safe zone. However, even with this assumption, Stokes authentication method is not equivalent to what is recited in Applicant's claim 1. This is because Stokes never makes the following determination:

upon a request for access to a file stored on said computer, utilizing said filter to access said first database and determine whether said file is within said safe zone;

Rather, Stokes merely presumes that all files are associated with access rights, and therefore 1) does not maintain Applicant's "first database", and 2) does not use a filter to make any determination as to whether files are within a safe zone.

To clarify the decision-making aspect of Applicant's claims 1, 16 and 31, Applicant has amended these claims to recite the following:

Claim 1: . . .

maintaining a first database which identifies files stored on the computer to be included in a safe zone, the computer having other files stored thereon that are not within any safe zone;

. . .
upon a request for access to a file stored on said computer, utilizing said filter to access said first database and determine whether said file is within said safe zone, and if said file is not within said safe zone, grant access to said file; . . .

These amendments are not believed to add new matter, and are supported, at least, by Applicant's FIG. 2.

Applicant's claim 1 is believed to be allowable for at least the above reasons. Applicant's claims 2, 5, 6, 9, 14-16, 17, 20, 21, 24 and 29-31 are believed to be allowable, at least, because they depend from claim 1, or for reasons similar to why claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

3. Rejection of Claims 3, 4, 18 and 19 Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 3, 4, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,903,720 to Stokes, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,189,032 to Susaki et al (hereinafter "Susaki").

With respect to Applicant's claim 3, the Examiner admits/asserts that:

Stokes does not show if access to a file is denied, then subsequently prompting said user to confirm or reverse said decision to deny access.

Susaki teaches displays (prompting) the identifier of a user who made the service supply request, user authority level, and identifier of the service being the object of the service supply request, which prompts to select a button to permit (confirm) or not permit (deny) the approval request (Susaki, col. 11, line 57-62), and suggests that even if an approval and consent are required in case a user of the client terminal receives a service that the server

provides, the access to the foregoing service by the concerned user can properly be controlled (Susaki, col. 2, line 48-52).

5/5/2005 Office Action, sec. 4, pp. 4-5.

The Examiner then asserts that it would have been obvious to merge Susaki's prompt system into Stokes' authentication system. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Susaki's approval system appears to be entirely user-driven. That is, according to Susaki's teachings, a user makes a decision to "approve" or "deny" an approval request, without any computer-implemented process first making a decision to "deny" an approval request. In Applicant's system, a computer-implemented process first makes a decision to "deny" an access, and a user is then prompted to "confirm" or "reverse" the computer's decision. In light of this difference, Susaki's approval system might be able to serve as a substitute for Stokes' authentication system, but is not believed to be amenable to being merged or combined with Stokes' authentication system.

Applicant's claim 3 is believed to be allowable for at least the above reasons. Applicant's claims 4, 8 and 19 are believed to be allowable, at least, because they depend from claims 1 or 3, or for reasons similar to why claims 1 or 3 are believed to be allowable.

4. Rejection of Claims 7, 8, 10, 22, 23 and 25 Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 7, 8, 10, 22, 23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,903,720 to Stokes, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,201 to Turnbull et al (hereinafter "Turnbull").

Applicant's claims 7, 8, 10, 22, 23 and 25 are believed to be allowable, at least, because 1) they depend from claim 1, or are allowable for reasons similar to why claim 1 is believed to be allowable; and 2) Turnbull does not disclose that which is missing from Stokes (see, Section 2 of these Remarks/Arguments, *supra*).

5. Rejection of Claims 11-13 and 26-28 Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 11-13 and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,903,720 to Stokes, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,647,400 to Moran.

Applicant's claims 11-13 and 26-28 are believed to be allowable, at least, because 1) they depend from claim 1, or are allowable for reasons similar to why claim 1 is believed to be allowable; and 2) Moran does not disclose that which is missing from Stokes (see, Section 2 of these Remarks/Arguments, *supra*).

6. Conclusion

Given the above Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
DAHL & OSTERLOTH, L.L.P.

By: 
Bruce E. Dahl
Reg. No. 33,670
Tel: (303) 291-3200